

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-20 are rejected.

The office action dated August 18, 2003 indicates that claims 1–5, 8-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Silverstein 6,339,463 in view of Check III U.S. Patent No. 5,463,491. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The '463 patent discloses a display device including a fiber-optic faceplate, liquid crystal (LC) material, and polarizers. The '463 patent does not teach or suggest the use of a suspended particle device (SPD) layer including particles in a suspension.

Claim 1 recites a display including fiber-optic faceplate and a layer of an SPD. The layer includes particle suspended in a liquid light valve suspension. The layer of the SPD device is used in place of the liquid crystal material and polarizers. Advantages of using the SPD device layer instead of the LC material/polarizers are discussed in the application.

The Check patent discloses an SPD film suitable for use as a light modulating unit of an SPD light valve (see page 4, lines 12-15 of the application). The film includes a cross-linked polymer matrix having droplets of a liquid light valve suspension distributed in the matrix.

The Check patent does not teach using the SPD film in combination with a fiber-optic faceplate, nor does it suggest replacing the liquid crystal cell and polarizers of the '463 patent with a layer of an SPD device. The passages cited in

the office action (at col. 2, lines 25-28; col. 15, lines 34-52; and col. 19, lines 64-67) do not teach or suggest the advantages (criticality) of using an SPD layer in place of LC material and polarizers. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10 should be allowed over the combination of the '463 patent and the Check patent.

Claims 11-18 also recite the combination of a fiber-optic faceplate and an SPD layer. Therefore, claims 11-18 should be allowed over the combination of the '463 patent and the Check patent.

Claims 19-20 have been cancelled and replaced by claims 21-23. For the reasons above, new claims 21-23 are believed to be allowable over the documents made of record.

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. No new subject matter has been added.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and issue a notice of allowability. If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.